DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 308 TM 820 348

AUTHOR Braskamp, Larry A.; And Others
TITLE Faculty Uses of Evaluative Information.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Course Evaluation; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Information Utilization; *Peer Evaluation; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance

ABSTRACT

Professors were interviewed to ascertain the evaluative information they collected about their professional activities. Student ratings were used by most faculty to evaluate their teaching. Almost all received peer reviews of research productivity. Qualitative evaluative information was seen as more credible than objective ratings when used for course improvement. Informal peer and editorial reviews of their research and scholarship were viewed as more credible than evaluations of instructional competence. Professors at all levels desired feedback on performance from their department administrator. Initial reaction to evaluative information was often emotional and affective. Full professors showed a greater reliance and trust in their own judgment and assessment. They became more tolerant of evaluations. The use of evaluative information for examining and changing career aspirations and choices varied with the rank of the professor. The feedback on research and scholarship also varied. As their professional role changes, faculty expand their definitions of professional success. With experience, professors became more self-reliant and used an internal set of standards against which they compared new evaluative information. Faculty preferred to be trusted and not evaluated, but realized knowledge of errors was necessary for improvement. They appreciated the importance of evaluations. (DWH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218308

FACULTY USES OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. C. Ory

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*Larry A. Braskamp
Deborah L. Fowler
John C. Ory
307 Engineering Hall
1308 W. Green Street
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

*Authors are listed alphabetically and each contributed equally.

TM 820 348

ABSTRACT

Faculty have available a diversity of evaluative information about their professional achievements, but use and credibility of information is dependent on type of achievement, function, and professional status. Faculty initially react emotionally to evaluations, but later integrate them into their thinking about their careers.

FACULTY USES OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION

Recently considerable attention has been given to the usefulness of evaluative information. Usefulness has become a major criterion for judging the merits of an evaluation. Usefulness and utility of evaluative information is variously defined, but most recently utilization has meant more than direct instrumental use by an audience for a specific decision. Audience enlightenment and increased understanding of issues, political constraints, strengths, and weaknesses of the program or person being evaluated are critical dimensions of the expanded conceptualization [2].

Despite this expanded view, the study of the utilization of evaluative information about faculty instructional efforts has been quite limited in scope. In previous studies, utilization has been tied to the impact or effect of informative evaluation on subsequent teaching performance of those receiving the feedback; i.e., do instructors become better teachers as measured by student ratings as a result of the feedback they have received? Two major reviews of this line of research have recently been completed [10, 4]. Cohen, in his meta-analysis of twenty-two studies, concludes that feedback within a consultative relationship results in greater improvement in subsequent teaching than feedback involving only the written information about student ratings. Rotem and Glassman, who use the framework "who says what to whom with what effect," conclude that the source of the feedback (students versus peers or supervisors), nature of the feedback (objective items versus student written comments), and attributes and personal characteristics of the

users (age, sex, and rank of faculty) are all related to changes in subsequent teaching performance. In the studies reviewed, the criterion used to assess impact of feedback on changes in instructor performance from prior to post feedback is student judgment about the quality of teaching.

The purpose of this study is to examine the usefulness and impact of evaluative information from the perspective of the user, the faculty members themselves. Faculty may be using information for enlightenment, insights, attitude changes, and making plans in their professional activities that may not be visible to others for several semesters or years. In this study, four specific questions were asked: (1) What types of evaluative information do faculty collect about their professional activities? (2) What types of evaluative information do faculty rate as credible for self improvement and personnel decisions? (3) How do faculty initially react when they receive evaluative information about their work? and (4) How do faculty use evaluative information for examining and changing career aspirations and choices?

Methodology

Fifteen assistant professors, fifteen associate professors, and eighteen full professors from the colleges of education, agriculture, liberal arts and sciences, engineering, and applied life studies at a large research university participated in the study. They had a diverse set of interests and responsibilities in research, teaching, and service, and acquired varying degrees of scholarly reputation. Six of the assistant professors had been at the university for less than two years; eight had been an assistant professor for two to six years, while one was a tenured faculty predominantly teaching for fifteen years. Fourteen of the fifteen assistant professors were in tenure-track positions. All associate professors were tenured.

Only four have been associate professors for more than nine years and four were promoted within the last four years. Of the eighteen full professors, eight were promoted to full professors in the 1960's and four were promoted within the last two years.

The data were collected through in-depth interviews. The interviews were standardized open-ended interviews and lasted from 45 minutes to 2 hours[9]. All faculty members were privately interviewed in their office by one of three professional staff members in an office of instructional resources. Each interviewer had considerable experience in interviewing adults. The exact wording and sequence of the questions were determined in advance although slight moderations were made in the questions as the interviews progressed. A pilot test of the interview schedule was conducted to determine appropriateness of content and to establish some standardization. There was, however, ample opportunity for faculty to pursue their own interests and interviewers probed when considered appropriate.

Extensive interview notes were taken during the interview but no tape recordings were made. The notes were summarized and analyzed in a three stage process. First, comments were read independently by each interviewer and from them a classification scheme was developed. Second, one interviewer reread the interview notes and classified the quotes into the categories of the classification scheme. Third, frequencies of similar responses within each category were determined separately for faculty by rank. For example, under the category "Types of quantitative information about teaching" the number of professors within each rank who indicated that they used fixed alternative items on the university student rating instrument were determined. This summarization served as the basis for identifying patterns and generalizations.

Results

Results are summarized for each group of professors by rank, organized by the four major questions asked in this study.

Question 1: What types of evaluative information do faculty collect about their professional activities? Almost all faculty collect student ratings to evaluate their teaching. All assistant and associate professors and all except three of the eighteen full professors used the campus student rating system. In the system, faculty are given the opportunity to select fixed alternative items as an addition to three items asked of every instructor: "Rate the course," "Rate the instructor," and "Rate the course content." On the back of the rating instrument, six open-ended questions are printed. Almost the same number of faculty indicated that they also used student written comments in evaluating their teaching.

Very few assistant professors mentioned using self evaluation methods even though faculty are required to submit an annual report to the departmental administrator for use in salary and promotion deliberations by the department. Associate and full professors mentioned their willingness to use their own internal standards in judging their performance. One professor said, "if I come out of the class feeling good that's how I rate my performance." Associate professors seemed to be switching from external to internal frames of reference for evaluation. One associate professor mentioned "after a couple of years I feel as though I am becoming self correcting in my teaching." Another associate professor mentioned "I am improving the course as I go along and I make changes right away based on student comments at the end of each laboratory session."

When asked if they used student achievement and accomplishments as a source of feedback, few faculty mentioned the linkage between student

performance and their own effectiveness. Only two associate and two full professors said they make a conscious effort to judge their effectiveness on "how well students do" and "performance on exams." One associate professor with excellent student ratings mentioned that he indirectly tries to measure student achievement by "giving students a list of concepts and asking them to indicate whether or not each concept was adequately covered in class.

Faculty, especially the assistant professors, collect informal information about instruction. Seven assistant professors stated that they use informal conversations with students as a check on how well they are doing in the classroom. At the end of an advising session, faculty often ask students "how the class is going." Professors did not mention conversations with students as much but indicated diversity in the types of evaluation techniques they use. One "designs his own written form" for each class. Another "asks all students to write an individual evaluation--recommendations for change, comments on reading, lectures, and topics. The students don't get their grade until they submit an evaluation."

Almost all faculty continuously receive peer reviews of their research productivity but the source of the reviews varied by rank. Assistant professors most often mentioned journal editors and colleagues within the department as their peer review. In one college, assistant professors circulate "working papers" as an outlet for colleague reviews. Associate professors mentioned a wider range of sources. Four mentioned citations, three mentioned requests for reprints, and two mentioned evaluations of grant proposals. Full professors mentioned an even wider range, with funding from agencies such as NSF and invited presentations as most important.

Full professors mentioned more often their development of informal means to assess their status as a scholar. One mentioned that he initiates

discussions with his nationally recognized colleagues. Another mentioned "the number of times my colleagues read my work and want to talk to me." To another, "graduate students let you know when you publish good stuff." Invited talks were also mentioned by more than one full professor as a good indicator of their prominence in the field.

Almost every professor of all ranks completed an annual report for departmental administrators and faculty advisory committees to use for salary adjustments. But less than half had a personal visit with the department or chairperson to discuss their performance. Only five assistant, six associate, and two full professors have a scheduled formal review of their work on an annual basis. Almost all received a form letter or a note indicating what their salary would be. Except in a few cases, the letters only included salary information.

Question 2: What types of evaluative information do faculty rate as credible for self improvement and personnel decisions? Faculty viewed the credibility of the various types of evaluative information about teaching performance differently depending on their rank and the purpose of the evaluation. Student ratings on the fixed alternative items (such as "Rate the instructor," and other objective items) were not viewed as generally helpful by faculty at all ranks, especially by associate and full professors. One associate professor indicated that "the ratings tended to fluctuate--you never know how they are going to come out," and "they are almost useless as a tool for improving. They merely give you a standard." "There is too much ambiquity in interpreting the results" according to a professor.

Faculty expressed their concern over being compared with other faculty. As one faculty member said, "Given the highly favorable marks by students, a faculty member to be ranked about average needs to be liked by everyone. For many, this is not possible and thus faculty are demoralized by them."

Another asked "is it fair to establish norms to that by definition one half of the faculty must be average and below?" Another mentioned that "they are disastrous because it causes Mickey Mousery T.V. productions in the classroom." A professor with many years of teaching experience and good ratings has recently become more cynical of them, and another regarded them skeptically "because students give a disproportionate amount to style and personality." Another professor has "never found them very useful--they made an enormous negative contribution to good teaching on this campus."

Despite the skepticism over the credibility and usefulness of student ratings, a few defended student ratings based upon fixed alternative items. They provide "a global judgment," "an index of comparison," and "they are good for meeting departmental information needs." Finally one faculty member stated that he "really pays attention when the results are negative."

The credibility of qualitative evaluative information, such as student written comments, informal discussions with students outside of class, and discussions with students during class, were viewed by faculty as much more credible than objective ratings when used for course improvement. "Student comments are straightforward and candid," "they are more informative than ratings," "they tell you more about what students are thinking," "they represent more serious student concerns than the student ratings," and "they are so much more personal." Some faculty also expressed an interest in student comments because they are more useful for planning. One said that he "is able to take comments much more seriously because of the specific suggestions included." Another indicated that he "looks at the comments for surprises, signals, and themes."

Not all faculty, however, took every written comment seriously. One assistant professor called them "a bubbling volcano," because students will take extreme positions when given the opportunity to comment freely. He

used this to explain the biomodal distribution of favorable and unfavorable comments he receives. A full professor stated "comments are evaluative too, but some of them are just nasty. The same kind of comments have kept coming up for the last seven years. All that it does is upset me." One professor "just skimmed the back," and another stated that he prefers face-to-face feedback. One faculty member who has been teaching for twenty-five years, felt that "students make fewer and fewer factual comments because they are no longer taking them [student evaluations] as seriously as they once did."

Despite the diversity in sources of feedback that faculty use to help them assess their own competence in scholarly works, faculty tend to view informal peer and editorial reviews of their research and scholarship as more credible and important than student or colleague evaluations of their instructional competence. Faculty of all ranks considered reviews to be helpful, especially when reviews were detailed. One full professor mentioned "they are the most important source of feedback to improving one's research." They did not easily dismiss the feedback because of its direct link to acceptance of works in refereed journals and funding. Some, however, expressed some frustration over formal review systems. One associate professor concluded that it was a "closed club and he had ceased to fight it," and had stopped publishing. Two others felt that many reviewers often do not know the field and cannot evaluate properly.

Assistant professors tended to be the most apprehensive and negative about the annual review process within the academic departments. Since they are not yet on the executive advisory committees in the department, they must rely on the formal process (annual report) as a basis for assessing their progress. If they did not have an annual review, they seem to be at a loss. One mentioned, "I feel like I am in a vacuum;" another said

"I am not really sure how to get promoted." Another mentioned, "the chair says that time is not spent with those who are doing okay." And one said "I really did not know--I found out my salary two days before school began."

Associate professors are more aware of how the department operates and feel as though they can initiate feedback. Four specifically mentioned that if they wanted more feedback, they could get it. Another said, "I am not shy about keeping a department head informed throughout the year." Two stated they have become more skeptical of the importance of feedback from the department head. Another mentioned, "for the last ten years feedback has become more immaterial." Two others said that the head is not a specialist and thus is not well informed about their research. Another stated, "I never really know; the department head tells me I am doing well but when I look in the gray book (the campus salary book) to look at salary increases of the departmental faculty, I always receive average salary increases." Finally one mentioned, "I am thoroughly evaluated--whether I am well evaluated is sometimes of question."

Full professors generally became less and less reliant on feedback from the department. Some are on the committees which make salary adjustments, and most recognize that the department head/chairperson is very busy. Some developed informal networks with faculty in their area which provide channels for mutual exchange of advice and help. One said, "I can be very honest with my full professor colleagues. We now have the self confidence to accept criticism from peers."

Despite the relative infrequency of planned individual meetings with the department head, professors at all ranks desired feedback about their work from the department administrator. Several faculty members discussed the impact of a meeting with their department head in their first year as

as a professor. One full professor can recall the hour he spent with his department head over thirty years ago in which he discussed what he did the first year and how he was told he should alter his research plans (which he subsequently did). One associate professor can remember very vividly a series of events that led up to one dramatic meeting with a senior faculty member. "For four years I did research in a very specific area where I had lost my competitive advantage. I started getting signals from a senior faculty that I should branch out and latch onto a new topic that was hot. That was the best feedback that I received, but it [the feedback] was given in such a way that I felt terrible about myself. It came during a very negative meeting. I went to him seeking career advise, and he came off the wall at me and dumped a lot of negative affect. He told me I wasn't going to get anywhere in my current area, that I needed to change areas. The meeting was very stressful. When I came to terms with the discussion after two weeks, I found a couple of real pearls there, even though the motivation and the manner were foreign. I'm glad I was able to sift through it. It is the great irony of my career because it was associated with so much negative affect and personal stress. It is the best decision I ever made. I got in on the ground floor of a new area of research and feel that I am again riding the crest of a wave."

Question 3: How do faculty initially react when they receive evaluative information about their work? Professors at all ranks and ages freely talked about how sensitive and anxious they are when receiving evaluative information. Assistant professors take all types of evaluations very seriously, altho[illegible] two mentioned they use to take evaluation even more personally in their first couple of years. One said, "Now I know that courses have an effect. I am still sensitive but more realistic." Four others indicated some despair and anger over evaluations of their work, regardless of the source of evalua-

tion. One stated "students cannot separate their dislike for me from their impression of the course." One assistant professor "just came off a grant refusal" and is "thinking twice about trying again." Others said, "it makes me depressed and frustrated but I generally recover," and "the editor's comments made me so angry and depressed that I thought it was a severe injustice. I am milder about it now but not much."

Associate professors generally take a different posture toward evaluation. One said "I used to give student ratings every week of class for the first two or three years. I stopped this because it was time-consuming and I stopped wanting to appear as though I needed it." Others said, "I have become less fearful and more willing to look at it realistically as feedback than as criticism. I used to take them to heart. At first it was very soul searching. I now weigh the good with the bad." Another one took a more cynical view of it, stating "I have come to see evaluation as nothing more than critical material." Another had developed enough self confidence to more realistically handle evaluative information--"lots of negative feedback really does not hurt if I think what I am doing is right. I will continue. I care less and less about what other people say. I feel I am becoming a professor. I have something to say."

Full professors show an even greater reliance and trust in their own judgment and assessment. They also express a greater tolerance for evaluation because many have come to accept their own image of themselves as a professional and how others view them. One stated, "I used to take them at face value but now I see the need for interpretation." Another said, "they had the greatest impact earlier in my career. I found them extremely helpful. They don't have much meaning to me now. I have read so many I know by now what I am like." Another stated, "I have found them very threaten-

ing. A lot of my ratings were negative. I learned eventually that some of the reactions were not well versed." Finally one stated, "I have become more tolerant. I used to think my peers didn't know anything. I still get a little annoyed at negative criticism of my work, however."

Professors have not become completely immune to evaluation. Few can totally ignore the threat and anxiety associated with evaluation. They still feel anxious, threatened, and depressed, especially when they initially learn of how well they have done. The sensitivity toward evaluation remains acute throughout their professional life. Two professors stated they have become more rather than less upset over poor student evaluations. Full professors seem to more vividly talk about their emotional reaction toward evaluative information and the subsequent behavior they have taken. One said "it resulted in a lot of soul searching. I applied for a grant in a project I felt was good. It was rejected two years in a row. It caused me to change directions. Had this not happened I would probably have retained interest in research and less in teaching." Another full professor, who has made a substantial contribution to the field in one area over the past twenty years, still regrets that he changed fields early in his career based upon a department head's evaluation.

Another senior faculty member with a national reputation said that the senior faculty in the department "placed me with an enormous amount of pressure [to publish]. It resulted in problems with my personal life. I considered leaving academia. Why should I put up with this hassle? To this day I don't have a close personal relationship with the two key people who provided me with this information." Another full professor who received poor student ratings said "my feelings were badly hurt. The reasons for wanting to understand them had less to do with my teaching than it did with my personal life. The sixty students saw me as cold and impersonal. I

wondered how I came off to other people?" Another full professor mentioned "not getting an article published can rip you to the core. What could kill you is rejection. You realize that your peers are prejudiced. All your work can be dismissed by two or three colleagues."

Question 4: How do faculty use evaluative information for examining and changing career aspirations and choices? If the initial reaction to evaluation is emotional and affective, the long range impact can be characterized as cognitive. Professors at any rank generally do not dismiss evaluative information; rather they view the information as symbolic of a problem they need to address.

The solutions to changing their teaching vary depending upon the rank of the faculty. Assistant professors have changed their teaching in a number of ways based upon feedback. They have organized their class and adopted different teaching styles to satisfy students. Some felt they had moved more from the theoretical to the practical. They also felt they are more conscious of student needs and viewpoints. For example, one returned papers to the students sooner.

Associate professors mentioned many changes as a result of evaluative information about their teaching. Two indicated they improved their course, and another instituted new courses. Another stated, "as a graduate student, when I was teaching, students felt I really didn't care. The first year I worked real hard on it, but they [students] were still frightened to death of me. I have tried to be gentler. One associate professor "was told I talked too fast so I began to distribute lecture notes to help students comprehend the material."

Full professors seemed more sanguine about changes as a result of evaluation. A full professor felt that changing what you do is practically

impossible. Another mentioned, "if I get a low mark, I try to evaluate it. I am not going to compromise--I am here to teach."

The feedback on research and scholarship also varied depending upon the rank of the professor. Assistant professors feel the pressure most acutely. One assistant professor stated that he needs to "improve the quality of his work, to become more sophisticated." Two others mentioned they needed to publish more and one stated "I have established a goal to write a paper every month in hopes that I would do more." Another mentioned "proposal writing has caused me to vary my content area."

Associate professors talked as much about changes made in the past as ones planned for the future. Some of the changes were rather radical. One had changed disciplines and switched from a department in the biological sciences to human services. Another associate professor in his fifties stated, "three years ago I discussed my long-term goals with my department head. He presented me a challenge--to make a major unique contribution. That led me to abandon my work in [my specialty] and focus on [another specialty]. It led me to reprioritize and refocus. I don't know whether it's going to pay off. It's scary." One felt as though he had changed interests to make his research more relevant to meet the needs of the professionals within the state. He felt that his previous contributions were too impractical and in the long run would not help his department make the impact he would like.

Not everyone actively responds to feedback. One associate professor still resists any changes in his career since "my discipline is very faddish and I resist the trends. I'm interested in what I'm interested in. I know what I'm doing is interesting and important." Another felt that he should change to get promoted to full professor, but stated "I know I should publish more but no one said point blank that I should."

Full professors naturally were the most reflective about the role of evaluation in their research careers. They generally mentioned more past influences of feedback than current impact. They range from the dramatic to little or no impact. For example, one had switched research field based on a first year confrontation with his department chairperson, a change still regretted nearly thirty years later. However, professors do not ignore the latest advances in their field of work. As one stated, "I am constantly changing as a result of changes in the field." Others become more selective in whom they will listen to. Some no longer listen to colleagues here at the university but take seriously what close colleagues at other institutions say about their work. Others who are not as successful in their research no longer have much interest or need to learn from others the quality of their work.

Discussion

Generalizing these results to other institutions should be done with caution. Two major caveats must be acknowledged. First, the comments presented in this paper are from faculty at a major research institution whose expectations and standards are quite narrow but very powerful [3]. The environmental press as perceived by those faculty is quite clear--scholarly production is essential for advancement within the university. Second, a considerable amount of institutionalized evaluation procedures are in force. A centralized student rating system has existed on campus for nearly twenty years and about one half of the faculty use this system. Furthermore, a large amount of documentation is required for the promotion and tenure review process.

Faculty interviewed in this study are continuously evaluating themselves. Some of the evaluation is formal and externally mandated, but much of it is informal and self initiated. As faculty become more experienced

they tend to increase the variety of methods and means by which they receive feedback about their effectiveness as a teacher and scholar. Faculty define success differently as they perceive changes in their status or role within the university and/or profession. As explained by social information processing theory of behavior [11], faculty, like all individuals, "adopt attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs to their social context and to the reality of their own past and present behavior and situation (p. 226)." As their professional role changes, faculty often expand their definitions of professional success. For example, full professors rely on invited addresses and informal conversations with experts--two means that are not very realistic for someone just entering the profession. They also use different evaluative information to assess their professional achievements. New sources of evaluative information are sought because faculty report that they are unable to learn much new from the same source or methods. For example, student feedback about their teaching is endlessly repetitive to many older professors. If the information collected ceases to be informational, then the feedback becomes superfluous as suggested by Thorndike [7].

As faculty gain experience, they also tend to become more self reliant and adopt an internal set of standards against which they compare new evaluative information. In the early years, judgments of others play a larger role. Possibly, the role ambiquity for the student turned teacher leads them to look to others for professional identity and self appraisal [5]. The role of evaluative information shifts from one of self image formation to one of comparison with a more established self image. The need for external evaluation lessens as one gains experience but the demand for evaluation never ceases.

Most faculty have interest in checking how well they are doing; it is built into academia. As scholars, they need to be evaluative and discerning in their work; thus to be evaluative about themselves is rational and logical. However, faculty differentially rate the credibility of various types of evaluative information depending on how they plan to use the information. Faculty valued more highly student written comments for course revisions and changes in their teaching style than student ratings on scale items, but they gave more credence to numbers based on the scaled items when decisions regarding promotion and tenure were involved; a finding similar to one based on a simulation study by Ory and Braskamp [8]. Faculty regarded the peer review process as credible when their research productivity was to be evaluated. Only a few questioned its appropriateness. For nearly everyone, judgments of scholarship by peers is fundamental to academe.

Faculty can vividly recall evaluative information that is most discrepant from their expectation, and information that is confirmatory is not mentioned as often. At first reading, the tone of the faculty reactions to evaluation seems not very sanguine or positive. Seldom do faculty mention that evaluation from others has reinforced their initial goals or provided them with encouragement to further pursue their line of work. There may be several reasons for this subdued tone. First, people do not take evaluation lightly; they view evaluation as highly personal [1]. Second, faculty may be similar to administrators who indicated that "research can make substantial contributions to their work by challenging the ideas currently in vogue and providing alternative cognitive maps" [12, p. 226]. When faculty are challenged, they need to rethink their present self-assessment of their professional worth and accomplishments. Or perhaps faculty feel that they cannot tell

others of their positive evaluations but consider a revelation of a problem or weakness to be more socially and professionally acceptable.

The dramatic shifts in career plans were infrequent but those who reported them often related a meeting with an authority figure in which their future "value" is discussed. Information communicated within a face-to-face situation seems particularly memorable, especially if the evaluator has status and power over the person receiving the evaluation; e.g., departmental administrator. During these sessions more than a mere transfer of information is taking place. The emotionality of having to confront an assessment of oneself is not easily forgotten. Evaluation is not a mechanical transfer of data; instead it is a deeply personal endeavor, taken more seriously than one may publicly admit.

Faculty remember and still feel the sting of evaluation, regardless of their age and professional stature. They become anxious before they receive feedback even if the source is not considered highly credible; e.g., student ratings of teachings. Faculty take evaluative information seriously which may explain why they often try to avoid receiving feedback. However, throughout their career, faculty incorporate evaluative information into their thinking about their career plans. Their initial emotional reaction gives way to a deeper understanding of their professional skills and opportunities. They use feedback to help them determine which doors are being shut and which ones would most likely lead to success. The linkage between evaluation and development is stronger if use of evaluation is given a very broad interpretation. If usefulness is defined to include enlightenment and appreciation over a period of years, then evaluative information plays a larger role in the life of a faculty member. The influence although difficult to isolate and measure accumulates as the time perspective increases.

Finally, faculty appear to recognize a paradox in the use of evaluation [6]. Perhaps more than any other group of professionals, faculty believe in the need to have freedom and autonomy to experiment. Experimentation also has more failures and false leads than immediate visible successes. Faculty like to be trusted to their best and be left alone. But excellence also comes from critiques and feedback. Knowledge of errors is necessary for improvement. This dilemma is one most faculty recognize, and in the final analysis each must work through. In the interview, each was asked if their department would be a better place to work if no evaluation was undertaken. Not one faculty member argued for an evaluation-free environment.

REFERENCES

1. Braskamp, L.A. Selling life insurance and being an evaluator. Evaluation News, 1981, 2, 67-69.

2. Braskamp, L.A. and Brown, R.D. (eds.) Utilization of Evaluative Information. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

3. Braskamp, L.A., Fowler, D.L. and Ory, J.C. Faculty development and achievement: The faculty's view. Paper to be presented at annual meeting of American Education Research Association, March, 1982, at New York, NY.

4. Cohen, P.A. Using student ratings to improve instruction: A synthesis of research findings. Research in Higher Education, in press.

5. Festinger, L. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 114-140.

6. Glass, G.U. A paradox about excellence of schools and the people in them. Educational Researcher, 1975, 4, 9-13.

7. McKeachie, W.H. Psychology in America's Bicentennial Year. American Psychologist, 1976, 31, 819-833.

8. Ory, J.C. and Braskamp, L.A. Faculty perceptions of the quality and usefulness of three types of evaluative information. Research in Higher Education, in press.

9. Patton, M.Q. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

10. Rotem, A. and Glassman, N.S. On the effectiveness of students' evaluative feedback to university instructors. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 497-511.

11. Salancik, G.R. and Pfeffer, J. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1978, 23, 224-253.

12. Weiss, C.H. and Bucuvalas, M.J. The challenge of social research to decision making. In C.H. Weiss (ed.), Using Social Research in Public Policy Making. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1977, 213-233.